



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,553	03/29/2005	Lutz Telljohann	P70352US0	7908

136	7590	08/06/2007
JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC 400 SEVENTH STREET N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20004		

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, ANTHONY H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2854	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,553

Applicant(s)

TELLJOHANN, LUTZ

Examiner

Anthony H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 3-21 are objected to because inferentially recited elements and lack of proper antecedent basis. For examples, there is no proper antecedent basis for “the cleaned roller” (claim 1, lines 30-33, claim 14 line 2, claim 15 lines 9-11) and “the roller” (claim 8 line 3 and claim 21 line 2). Additionally, the element “a final roller” (claim 17, line 9) is inferentially recited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the specification, as original filed, does not provide support for the control equipment for automatically operating the process (claim 9) and the equipment to interrupt the automatic operation and enable manual control of the process (claim 10) as now claimed .

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Achelpohl et al. (US 5,816,163) in view of Elia et al. (US 5,213,044).

With respect to claims 1,3-5,7,11, 14, 17 and 19, Achelpohl teaches a process for cleaning roller 4 which includes the steps of removing or pumping ink out from a printing ink chamber 5, filling the ink chamber with solvent while the roller 4 is rotated, circulating the solvent inside the ink chamber and removing or pumping the solvent from the printing ink chamber. Achelpohl does not teach the step of interrupting communication between first roller or the screen roller from the remain rollers during cleaning process. Elia et al. teaches the step of interrupting the rollers 32,34 and 114 during a cleaning process as shown in Figs.3-7 of Elia et al. In view of the teaching of Elia et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process of Achelpohl et al. by providing the step of interrupting the rollers during cleaning as taught by Elia et al. to improve the efficiency of cleaning of printing rollers in a printing press. With respect to claims 6 and 20, the selection of the desired rotating speed and the position of the rollers would be obvious through routine experimentation based upon the solvent used for cleaning, the ink used for printing and the material of each roller in order to get best possible cleaning of the printing rollers. With respect to claims 8, 18 and 21,

Achelpohl et al. teaches that the screen roll 4 may be reversed during cleaning operation (Achelpohl, col.4 lines 36-38). With respect to claims 9 and 10, Achelpohl et al. teaches that the process of cleaning may be controlled by a control equipment i.e., a computer (Achelpohl et al., col.1 lines 57-59) and that the direction of ink roller is reversed at least once (Achelpohl et al., col.2 lines 27,28). With respect to claim 12, Fig.1 of Achelpohl et al. shows the conventional screen roll or an anilox roller 4 and a printing roller or a plate roller 3 which is an adjoining roller. With respect to claims 13 and 14, Elia et al. teaches that only the transfer roller or the first rollers 32 rotates when the first roller is separated from the form roller 114 (Fig.5) and the rollers rotate simultaneously when the rollers engage each other as shown in Fig.6 (Elia et al., col.7, fourth paragraph).

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed on May 22, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive of any error in the above rejections.

Applicant argues that the combination of Achelpohl and Elia et al. does not teach the process for cleaning of components of the rollers as recited in claim 1. Specifically, applicant argues that Achelpohl et al. teaches the cleaning of only a screen roller and Elia et al. teaches cleaning all the rollers by placing a transfer roll into a thrown-on position.

However, as explained above, Achelpohl clearly teaches the steps of cleaning roller including removing ink from the blade chamber, filling the chamber with solvent, circulating the solvent inside the chamber and removing the ink and solvent from the chamber. While Achelpohl does not clearly teach the step of interrupting between the rollers, Elia et al. teaches the step of interrupting the rollers including the step of cleaning the first roller (Elia et

Art Unit: 2854

al., Fig.7) in the cleaning process. Therefore, the combination of Achelpohl and Elia et al. renders obvious the steps as recited in the claims.

Conclusion

The patents to Schozig et al. and DeMoore et al. are cited to show other methods having obvious similarities to the claimed method.


Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2169.

The examiner can normally be reached daily from 9 AM to 5PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen, can be reached on (571) 272-2258.

The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.



Anthony Nguyen
07/30/2007
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800